United Nations A/C.3/59/SR.37

General Assembly
Fifty-ninth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
16 December 2004

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 37th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 4 November 2004, at 2.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Kuchinsky ..... (Ukraine)

Contents

Agenda item 105: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 94: Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

(a) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

Agenda item 96: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

Agenda item 97: International drug control (*continued*)

Agenda item 99: Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, entitled "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century" (*continued*)

Agenda item 102: Programme of activities for the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People, 1995-2004 (*continued*)

Agenda item 98: Advancement of women (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

04-59153 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 2.45 p.m.

Agenda item 105: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*) (A/C.3/59/L.33)

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.33: Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment

1. **Mr. Rehfeld** (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, announced that, in addition to those mentioned in the document, the following had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Croatia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Iceland, Italy, New Zealand, Paraguay, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine.

2. Although negotiations on the draft resolution had not yet been concluded, his delegation hoped that agreement would soon be reached. Combating torture was a matter of the highest priority for his Government and the draft resolution was yet another instrument in that fight. He hoped that the final version would be adopted without a vote.

3. **The Chairman** announced that the following had also become sponsors of the draft resolution: Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Dominican Republic, Mauritius, Mozambique and Namibia.

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/59/L.34 and L.35)

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.34: Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa

4. **Mrs. Mahouve** (Cameroon), speaking on behalf of the States members of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), said that the Centre's mandate was to help develop a culture of human rights and democracy in States members of the Community facing internal conflicts. Its main objectives were to train staff responsible for human-rights issues, support the creation and strengthening of national institutions responsible for human rights and democracy, disseminate information on the relevant international instruments and support civil-society organizations working on human-rights issues.

5. Since its inception in 2001, the Centre — in cooperation with subregional bodies, United Nations agencies and civil society — had organized seminars and workshops, bringing together over 900 participants and welcoming over 300 high-ranking visitors from civil society, Governments, the United Nations and student groups. It had also represented the High Commissioner for Human Rights on various occasions.

6. The success of the Centre's multidimensional activities meant that it was constantly consulted and therefore deserved the international community's support. The sponsors welcomed proposals to strengthen the Centre and allocate additional funds, and associated themselves with the call made by the High Commissioner for Human Rights for an increase in voluntary contributions.

7. The draft resolution had been updated to reflect such developments. It had also been revised to take account of the recommendations of the twenty-first ministerial meeting of the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, held in Malabo in June 2004. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

8. **The Chairman** announced that Algeria had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.35: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

9. **Mr. Elbadri** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft resolution did not seek to judge such a complex phenomenon as globalization, but rather to maximize its values in the field of human rights within existing international relations and in accordance with commonly accepted norms and values.

10. Human rights were not isolated principles confined to the realms of States; they were also susceptible to global factors, as demonstrated throughout history. Globalization was no different from previous phenomena; the world had been moulded into a shared social space through economic transformation and the technological revolution.

11. The aim of the draft resolution was to control the negative consequences of globalization, while expanding its positive aspects and harnessing the tremendous energy it produced. Account needed to be taken of the interdependence of global politics and

economics in today's world. The draft resolution therefore addressed such key issues as the interdependent nature of human rights, the multidimensional aspects of globalization and its effect on human rights, the need to respect the cultural particularities of different peoples while fostering multiculturalism, the importance of creating an international environment conducive to development, the need to expand the opportunities offered by globalization, and the importance of creating a transparent, democratic and equitable international system. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be widely supported.

12. **The Chairman** announced that the following had become sponsors of the draft resolution: Grenada, Guyana, Kenya, Mauritania, Myanmar and Somalia.

Agenda item 94: Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*)

(a) Social development, including questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family (*continued*) (A/C.3/59/L.18/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.18/Rev.1: Policies and programmes involving youth: tenth anniversary of the World Programme of Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and Beyond

13. **The Chairman** said that the revised draft resolution had no programme-budget implications.

14. **Ms. Carvalho** (Portugal) read out a number of further revisions to the text. Paragraph 5 should read: "Decides to facilitate access to the United Nations Headquarters by non-governmental organizations that were accredited to the World Conference of Ministers Responsible for Youth in 1998 and interested non-governmental organizations that are neither in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council nor were accredited to the World Conference of Ministers Responsible for Youth in 1998, to participate in the informal round table and side events during the tenth anniversary of the World Programme of Action for Youth." A new paragraph 7 bis should be added, to read: "Decides that the arrangements outlined in paragraph 5 shall in no way create a precedent for other similar events." She also announced that the following had become sponsors: the Bahamas, Chile, El Salvador, Madagascar, Mauritius, Namibia, Panama, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Ukraine.

15. **The Chairman** announced that the following had also become sponsors of the revised draft resolution: Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Israel, Jamaica, Kenya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, the Republic of Moldova, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

16. **Mr. Xie** Bohua (China), referring to paragraph 5, said that it was his delegation's understanding that any non-governmental organization participating in the informal round table and side events during the tenth anniversary of the World Programme of Action for Youth would be bound by the relevant General Assembly resolutions and regulations.

17. *Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.18/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

18. **Ms. France** (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) said that her country wished to become a sponsor of the revised draft resolution.

Agenda item 96: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/59/L.22/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.22/Rev.1: Strengthening the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity

19. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications.

20. **Mr. Cavallari** (Italy), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the draft resolution was more concise and focused than in previous years and he hoped that it would once again enjoy the full support of all delegations. Albania, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Bolivia, Botswana, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, the Republic of Moldova, Somalia, the Sudan, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe had also become sponsors.

21. *Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.22/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.*

22. **Ms. Londoño** (Colombia) said that Colombia reiterated the statement it had made when the General Assembly had adopted the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition. Colombia did not agree with the scope of application of article 4, paragraph 2, of the Protocol. Moreover, it considered that the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air lacked adequate implementation standards.

Agenda item 97: International drug control (*continued*) (A/C.3/59/L.19/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.19/Rev.1: International cooperation against the world drug problem

23. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that paragraph 4 of part III of the draft resolution stated that the General Assembly, inter alia, noted that the International Narcotics Control Board needed sufficient resources to carry out all its mandates, and emphasized the need to maintain its capacity, inter alia, through the provision of appropriate means by the Secretary-General and adequate technical support by the United Nations International Drug Control Programme. The General Assembly had appropriated the amount of $20,006,900 under Section 17, International drug control, for the biennium 2004-2005, of which $5,953,800 was for the activities of the Board. Accordingly, should the Third Committee adopt the draft resolution, there would be no requirement for additional appropriation.

24. He drew the Committee's attention to the provisions of resolution 45/248, part B VI, in which the General Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

25. **Ms. Feller** (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that informal consultations had been held to ensure that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote. The revised text had been agreed by the sponsors. Armenia, Belgium, Belize, Bulgaria, China, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, India, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mauritius, Mongolia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Kingdom and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

26. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Angola, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, the Comoros, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Egypt, Estonia, the Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nigeria, Norway, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, the Sudan, Viet Nam, Zambia and Zimbabwe had also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

27. *Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.19/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.*

28. **Ms. Londoño** (Colombia) said that Colombia reiterated the statement it had made when the General Assembly had adopted the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition. Colombia did not agree with the scope of application of article 4, paragraph 2, of the Protocol. Moreover, it considered that the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air lacked adequate implementation standards.

Agenda item 99: Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women and of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, entitled "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century" (*continued*) (A/C.3/59/L.23)

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.23: Elimination of all forms of violence against *women, including crimes identified in the outcome document of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly, entitled "Women 2000: gender equality, development and peace for the twenty-first century"*

29. **Mr. Hayee** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said he hoped the draft resolution would once

again enjoy the full support of all delegations and be adopted by consensus. Argentina, the Bahamas, Bahrain, Belarus, Cameroon, Cape Verde, the Comoros, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Kazakhstan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Namibia, Nigeria, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Senegal, Somalia, Thailand, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yemen had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.23 was adopted without a vote.*

31. **Ms. Helal** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia and New Zealand, said that, while the three countries had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, they remained concerned that it did not do justice to the important work achieved by the international community in its efforts to eliminate violence against women, through recent international instruments and programmes of action which set standards for national and international action in that area. They confirmed their fundamental support for those initiatives and looked forward to the study on violence against women requested by the Member States during the fifty-eighth session of the General Assembly. They remained hopeful about what the General Assembly and the Member States could achieve to protect women's human rights and would continue to work with all States to achieve meaningful progress in the elimination of violence against women.

32. **Ms. Bakker** (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that it had joined the consensus because it attached great importance to the elimination of violence against women. However, it believed that the draft resolution did not include several elements needed in a resolution on such an important subject, including a definition of violence against women and an unequivocal condemnation of all such acts. It failed to address the obligation of States to prevent and punish such acts and did not call on them to consider ratifying the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and its Optional Protocol. The recognition that violence had an impact on the physical and mental health of women was absent, as was mention of the need to eliminate impunity for violence against women and girls in situations of armed conflict. The call on States not to invoke custom, tradition or practice in the name of religion or culture was not included, and there was no reference to relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. All the foregoing were included in resolution 2004/46 of the Commission on Human Rights, and the European Union considered that resolution to be the authoritative United Nations text on the subject.

33. The European Union attached great importance to the upcoming study on violence against women and hoped that it would help the General Assembly address the issue. In preparation for the review of the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, it was vitally important to include all relevant elements in the deliberations and to address all remaining challenges in the fight to eliminate violence against women.

Agenda item 102: Programme of activities for the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People, 1995-2004 (*continued*) (A/C.3/59/L.30)

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.30: Second International Decade of the World's Indigenous People

34. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications.

35. **Mr. Cumberbatch Miguén** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that, in the fourth line of the third preambular paragraph, the word "peoples" should be changed to "people" as the text was a direct quotation from General Assembly resolution 48/163. In the last preambular paragraph, the word "and" should be inserted after the word "Decade," and the last phrase, commencing "including support from within ...", should be deleted.

36. Armenia, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cyprus, Fiji, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Honduras, Italy, Nigeria and Uruguay had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

37. **Ms. Espindola** (Ecuador), speaking on behalf of the Andean Community (Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela), said that the first International Decade of the World's Indigenous People had provided an opportunity to increase awareness of the situation of those peoples and to identify viable solutions for their most pressing problems. The Andean Community supported the draft resolution because it considered

that a second decade would give greater impetus to the efforts already undertaken and focus new initiatives on the full development of that sector of the population. Indigenous peoples required special attention as they were one of the groups most affected by poverty and hunger. The Millennium Development Goals reflected their aspirations, and their well-being depended on the achievement of those goals. The international community had a clear obligation towards the indigenous peoples of the world.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.30, as orally revised, was adopted without a vote.*

39. **Mr. Choi** (Australia) said his delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution as it was consistent with Australia's position that a Second International Decade of the World's Indigenous People should be coordinated by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs in order to ensure that there was no duplication of the agenda of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. However, his delegation wished to make clear that its support for the consensus did not imply support for a possible extension of the mandate of the working group of the Commission on Human Rights charged with elaborating a draft declaration on the rights of indigenous people for a further decade, and it urged the working group to finalize negotiations on the draft declaration within the term of its current mandate.

40. **Ms. Zack** (United States of America) said indigenous people in many parts of the world still faced discrimination. The United States stood with indigenous people who sought greater control over their destinies, and believed that recognizing the ability of indigenous groups to make decisions on issues affecting them enhanced their well-being and the harmony between nation-States and indigenous people.

41. The United States believed a declaration on the rights of indigenous people that had the support both of indigenous groups and of those States that had significant indigenous populations would have a concrete effect. But to achieve practical results, political will was needed to complete the negotiations. All those involved now knew what was achievable and what was not. It did indigenous people no good for some States to hold out the prospect of benefits they could not deliver. It was particularly telling that those States then claimed that they had no indigenous populations to which the provisions they were promoting would apply.

42. Instead of working to bring the negotiations in the working group to a successful conclusion, they had suggested extending the deadline, which would mean the benefits those States promised would not be realized. It was for that reason that the United States did not favour renewing the mandate of the working group beyond the sixty-first session of the Commission on Human Rights. It believed it was possible to conclude a declaration on the rights of indigenous people before then, as called for in Commission resolution 1995/32, and understood that the draft resolution just adopted did nothing to change that deadline. The United States had joined the consensus as a means of highlighting the plight of indigenous people and the need for concerned States to redouble their efforts to complete the declaration.

43. As her delegation understood it, the Voluntary Fund for the Second Decade would be the source of funding for programmes and projects for that decade. Her delegation also wished to note that the use of the term "indigenous peoples" in the draft resolution did not imply the attachment of any particular rights under international law.

44. **The Chairman** suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the following documents: the note by the Secretary-General on the status of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations (A/59/257); the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people (A/59/258); and the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the implementation of the programme of activities for the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People (A/59/277).

45. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 98: Advancement of women (*continued*) (A/C.3/59/L.26 and 36)

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.26: Future operation of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women

46. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on the draft resolution and drew attention to document A/C.3/59/L.36 containing a statement of programme-budget implications of the draft resolution.

47. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) read out oral revisions made by the representative of Qatar in introducing the draft resolution at the 34th meeting.

48. **The Chairman** announced that Grenada had become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

49. **Mr. Al-Sulaiti** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, which were sponsoring the draft, said that, despite the progress made, the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) still faced many challenges. He was convinced, however, that it would rise to meet them and win over those who continued to have reservations.

50. **Ms. Sánchez de Cruz** (Dominican Republic), speaking as one of the sponsors, said INSTRAW needed support at a crucial time in order to be able to press on with its work as a key instrument for the advancement of women worldwide. It was the only United Nations institution with such a mandate and one of only three United Nations institutions located in a developing country. Her delegation urged all Member States to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

51. **The Chairman** said a recorded vote had been requested by the delegations of Japan and the United States.

52. **Mr. Choi** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada, Denmark, Finland, New Zealand and the United Kingdom in explanation of vote before the voting, said the Governments concerned were committed to the advancement of women, the promotion and protection of women's rights worldwide and the ultimate goal of gender equality, and would remain engaged in the various United Nations efforts to achieve those aims. They were some of the largest contributors to those programmes.

53. However, those Governments did not believe that repeated recourse to the regular budget was the appropriate mechanism for ongoing funding of INSTRAW. Rather, they felt strongly that such funding should come strictly from voluntary contributions, in accordance with the Institute's Statute. In the light of those misgivings, the delegations concerned were not able to support the draft resolution.

54. **Ms. Fried** (Sweden), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said Sweden was a committed and outspoken advocate for the promotion and protection of women's full enjoyment of all human rights and the achievement of gender equality worldwide. It worked to ensure integration of women's rights into all United Nations work on human rights and strongly supported efforts to mainstream a gender perspective in all United Nations processes.

55. Sweden participated fully in the various United Nations processes in order to achieve its foreign-policy goals of consistency and results in human rights. While the United Nations system should allocate more resources to gender mainstreaming, those resources should, however, be used efficiently and in a results-oriented manner. Sweden, itself a past donor to INSTRAW, had engaged constructively in the discussions on the Institute's future but remained to be convinced that it had a comparative advantage in the field of gender research and could not endorse the suggestion of funding from the regular United Nations budget. Consequently, it could not support the draft resolution.

56. **Mr. Fox** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, while recognizing the efforts being made by INSTRAW to revitalize itself, his delegation believed that it should be funded from voluntary contributions from countries that chose to make such contributions in support of its work. His delegation regretted that the General Assembly was once again being requested to provide funding from the regular budget, which would drain limited resources from higher-priority United Nations activities.

57. **Ms. Ohashi** (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said Japan attached particular importance to the advancement of women and was itself a past donor to INSTRAW. Her Government sincerely hoped the Institute would eventually become self-sustaining. In the meantime, however, it could not

allow regular-budget funding to continue to be allocated as an emergency measure, as had happened four times already. In Japan's view, INSTRAW should not ask for such funding even as an emergency measure, since that tended to undermine its efforts to regain the trust of Member States. It was a matter of discipline and not related to gender issues. Her delegation would be voting against the draft resolution and urged others to do likewise.

58. *A recorded vote was taken on the draft resolution.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Japan, Latvia, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Fiji, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovenia, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine.

59. *Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.26, as orally revised, was adopted by 128 votes to 10, with 29 abstentions.*

60. **Mr. Cos Pereira** (Portugal) said his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.26 because it believed in INSTRAW's aims and in the willingness and ability of its director to give the Institute a new and focused approach. In the months ahead, Portugal would be following INSTRAW's activities closely and hoped that new management would succeed in making the Institute a more dynamic and relevant body.

61. **Mr. Arias** (Panama), speaking in exercise of the right to reply, referred to comments made by the representative of Cuba at the previous meeting with regard to the pardon granted by the outgoing President of Panama to four Cuban nationals convicted of various offences and awaiting appeals. The new Government of Panama had deplored the granting of those pardons, since the offences had been of an extremely serious nature. His Government was committed to confronting the threat of terrorism wherever it originated, regardless of political or emotional considerations, and Panama intended to preserve its own neutrality at all costs. Under the Constitution, no pardons should be granted for terrorist, drug or money-laundering offences. Cuba was well aware of Panama's position in that regard.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.